IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

KENNETH M. SMITH,

Petitioner,
)

v.

Civil Action No. 05-262-SLR
)

THOMAS CARROLL,
Warden,
)

Respondent.
)

ORDER

At Wilmington this _8 day of August, 2005; IT IS ORDERED that:

Petitioner Kenneth M. Smith's letter motion requesting representation by counsel is DENIED without prejudice to renew.

(D.I. 10)

Petitioner, a pro se litigant, has no automatic constitutional or statutory right to representation in a federal habeas proceeding. See Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 752 (1991); Reese v. Fulcomer, 946 F.2d 247, 263 (3d Cir. 1991); United States v. Roberson, 194 F.3d 408, 415 n.5 (3d Cir. 1999). However, a court may seek representation by counsel for a petitioner "upon a showing of special circumstances indicating the likelihood of substantial prejudice to [petitioner] resulting . . . from [petitioner's] probable inability without such assistance to present the facts and legal issues to the court in a complex but arguably meritorious case." Tabron v. Grace, 6

F.3d 147, 154 (3d Cir. 1993) (citing <u>Smith-Bey v. Petsock</u>, 741
F.2d 22, 26 (3d Cir. 1984); 18 U.S.C. § 3006A

(a) (2) (B) (representation by counsel may be provided when a court determines that the "interests of justice so require"). Here,
Petitioner seeks representation by counsel because he believes
"that had [he] had an attorney when initially charged, [he] would not be in this current situation." (D.I. 10) This reason fails to demonstrate that the interests of justice warrant representation by counsel at this time.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE